



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/970,389

10/02/2001

Donald J. Merkley

129843-1022

9683

60148 7590 05/29/2009

GARDERE / JHIF  
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL, LLP  
1601 ELM STREET  
SUITE 3000  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

HALPERN, MARK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/970,389	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MERKLEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Mark Halpern	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-38 and 40-48 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-38, 40-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/24/08, 5/13/09</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) Acknowledgement is made of Response received 2/24/2009.

Claims 25-38, 40-48 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 2) Claims 25-38, 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yamada (JP 11-10631).

Yamada discloses composite building material made up of cement mixed with pulp of cellulosic fiber. The mixture composition is made of 200 g of Portland cement and 20 g of pulp added to water. The pulp is thus 11 % of the mixture of pulp and cement. The Yamada pulp cement mixture Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) is 5 ppm (0.000,005)

Art Unit: 1791

or less, which is lower than the claimed COD of less than 4.5 kg/ton which calculates to 0.00225 (Abstract Pg. 2, whole document Pgs. 3-7). Claims 25 and 33 recite washing at “the elevated temperature...between 65 degrees Centigrade to about 120 degrees Centigrade,” The washing at the elevated temperature does not structurally differentiate the material in the product by process claims 25-38, 40-48 over the cited prior art.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 25-38, 40-48, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Yamada, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

### ***Response to Amendment***

3) Applicants' arguments filed 2/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants allege that the cited prior art, Yamada, does not disclose the invention because Yamada discloses COD measured from the mixture of cement and cellulose fibers and not COD from cellulose fibers alone.

Yamada discloses pulp cement mixture Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) to be 5 ppm (0.000,005) or less, which is lower than the claimed COD of less than 4.5 kg/ton which calculates to 0.00225. The source of COD in the Yamada pulp cement mixture is the cellulose fibers. Yamada thus discloses the claimed COD level of the cellulose

Art Unit: 1791

fibers, or in the least it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, that Yamada discloses the claimed COD level in the cellulose fibers, since the source of COD in the mixture is the cellulose fibers.

Applicants allege that Yamada does not accurately disclose the COD levels because there may be impurities in the mixture that would contribute to the COD.

Even if there any impurities in the mixture, the level of COD in the Yamada disclosure is below the claimed amount.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 25-38, 40-48, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Yamada, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 by Professor Edmone Roffael has been reviewed and considered. The examiner finds the arguments not persuasive for reasons given above; the rejection as above is proper.

### ***Conclusion***

4) **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1791


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone no. is 571-272-1190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

/Mark Halpern/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1791

<b>Serial Number</b> 	<b>Application No.</b> 09/970,389	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MERKLEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Mark Halpern	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	